No. 666. 318

Office Supreme Court U.S.
FILED
MAY 19 1902
JAMES H. McKENNEY,
Clerk.

THE RUSSIAN SUGAR BOUNTY CASE.

Motion to advance.

Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1901.

Filed May 19, 1902.

ROBERT E. DOWNS,
Appellant,

vs.

THE UNITED STATES,
Appellee.

No. 666.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

ERNEST A. BIGELOW,
Attorney for Appellant.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States.

OCTOBER TERM, 1901.

ROBERT E. DOWNS, Appellant, vs. THE UNITED STATES, Appellee.	No.

MOTION TO ADVANCE.

The Supreme Court of the United States having this day granted the petition of the appellant herein for a writ of *certiorari* directed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit,

Comes now the appellant and prays the Court to advance this cause and set it down for early hearing in October Term, 1902.

The application is based on the facts set forth in the following

STATEMENT.

This is a revenue case, in which the United States are concerned, and which involves matters of general public interest.

The courts below have decided that Russia pays a bounty on the export of sugar and that the Secre-

tary of the Treasury was right in imposing, under the authority of Section five of the present tariff act, a countervailing duty on such sugar on its importation into this country. The Russian government, claiming this to be a discrimination against Russian commerce, has imposed the maximum tariff on American goods, thereby destroying the larger part of our trade with Russia and inflicting heavy losses on American manufacturers. Should this honorable Court decide that the courts below were in error, the countervailing duty must be removed and this will re-establish with Russia the friendly trade relations formerly obtaining.

The decision of the courts below, that drawbacks are bounties within the meaning and scope of Section five, vitally affects the revenue system of the United States.

The American protective system is directly concerned in the ruling that the application of a similar system by Russia constitutes bounty-paying.

Wherefore, it is respectfully submitted that these grave questions should be heard and settled by this honorable Court at the earliest possible moment, and the appellant is authorized to state that the Solicitor-General of the United States concurs in the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

ERNEST A. BIGELOW,
Attorney for Robert E. Downs, Appellant.

Washington, D. C.
May 19, 1902.